

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-40 are pending. Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. No new matter has been added herein.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-40

The instant Office Action states, “Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.102(e) as being anticipated by Janik et al. (US PG PUB No. 20020013852) in view of Schaeck et al. (US PG PUB No. 20030163513). Office Action mailed January 9, 2008, page 6, section 5. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the reason below.

Applicants respectfully submit that the instant Office Action’s rejection of Claims 1-40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is improper and Applicants respectfully solicit its withdrawal. Applicants respectfully note that “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, **in a single prior art reference**” (emphasis added). MPEP §2131; *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 103 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicants respectfully submit that the instant Office Action states that Claims 1-40 are anticipated by two references, not a single prior art reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the instant Office Action’s rejection of Claims 1-40 is improper and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above-listed remarks, the Applicants respectfully request allowance of the claims 1-40.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Date: 5/9/2008

/John P. Wagner, Jr./

John P. Wagner, Jr.

Reg. No. 35,398

123 Westridge Dr.
Watsonville, CA 95076